Zev

NOV 13 2006 B

SCHIFF HARDIN LLP

PATENT DEPARTMENT

6600 SEARS TOWER

233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606

Graumann et al

GROUP ART UNIT: 3739

SERIAL NO.:

10/615,527

EXAMINER: James M. Kish

FILED:

July 8, 2003

CONFIRMATION NO.:8192

TITLE: MEDICAL APPARATUS FOR TRACKING MOVEMENT OF A BONE FRAGMENT IN A DISPLAYED IMAGE

APPLICANTS' RESPONSE TO AUGUST 9, 2006 OFFICE ACTION

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT

E APPLICATION OF:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SIR

Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.

No additional fee is required.

The fee has been calculated as shown below.

			CLAIMS AS AMEND	ED		
	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		(4) HIGHEST NO. PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) PRESENT EXTRA	(6) RATE	(7) ADDITION FEE
TOTAL CLAIMS	*17	MINUS	** 20	X 18	() X 25.00 () X 50.00	
INDEP. CLAIMS	*2	MINUS	3	х	() X 100.00 () X 200.00	
Application amended to contain any multiple dependent claims not previously paid for.				(') YES () NO	()\$180.00 ()\$360.00 ONE TIME	
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT						-

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 8, 2006.

Steven H. Noll
NAME OF APPLICANT'S ATTORNEY
SIGNATURE
November 8, 2006

DATE



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICANTS' RESPONSE TO THE AUGUST 9, 2006 OFFICE ACTION

APPLICANTS:

Graumann et al.

CONFIRMATION NO.: 8192

SERIAL NO.:

10/615,527

GROUP ART UNIT: 3739

FILED:

July 8, 2003

EXAMINER: James M. Kish

TITLE:

MEDICAL APPARATUS FOR TRACKING MOVEMENT OF A

BONE FRAGMENT IN A DISPLAYED IMAGE

MAIL STOP AMENDMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

SIR:

Applicants and their counsel have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated August 9, 2006, but believe the claims in their present form are patentable over the teachings of the references relied upon by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following arguments in support of patentability is therefore respectfully requested.

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 9, 2006, claims 1-4, 6-13, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Foley et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

In substantiating this rejection, the Examiner made no mention whatsoever of a disclosure in the Foley et al. reference regarding a medical instrument adapted for introduction into the body of a subject that is adapted to interact with a bone fragment in the body of the subject to move the bone fragment, nor did the Examiner identify any disclosure in the Foley et al. reference regarding an image computer